Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion 20 30 1941

Volume 1, No. 23

e

o o e g

e ie or

n

te st

se

so

bc

n-

to

of

er,

to

-05

ent

ent

is-

re.

ny

the

ew

ple

be

ists

vho

ter

er-

the

Dr.

ies,

job,

ost-

t he

and

FS

ticle

ago

rgy-

on-

D 145

Perfodical 2

December 29, 1941

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

Christmas Light on History

CHRISTMAS has a special message for us in this war-darkened year; for Christmas reminds us of the Bible's interpretation of history.

Thinking men, looking out on the puzzling ongoings of the world have evolved various theories of the movement of human affairs. There is the *cyclical* theory, according to which history repeats itself; and the *deterioration* theory according to which history is degenerating from an ideal past; and the *escalator* theory, so popular in the recent past, and finally the *tug-of-war theory*, which interprets historical events as products of a tension between contradictory forces.

There is something in all these views; but Christmas is the supreme instance of the Bible's advent theory of history. God, the Creator and Controller of the world where man has power to thwart His purposes, keeps coming to His children. Individuals and nations have their earthly day, whose eternal significance is found when they know it as the time of their "visitation."

God, who is light, arrives a Dayspring from on high. The Sun of righteousness to a sinful earth exposes its evils and scorches them. In the face of Jesus Christ God's glory condemns the wrongs of our society: our racial discrimination, our assumption of a privileged standard of living as our national right, our lack of fellowship in sharing the nation's and the earth's heritage with consequent class and national struggles, our irresponsibility for the justice and order of mankind, the pride and greed in every life. These sins are the causes of suicidal war. To aroused consciences God's Self-disclosure in Jesus is "a consuming fire." "Who may abide the day of His coming?"

But to devout folk God's arrivals must always be welcome. They mean the destruction of ungodlike factors which render earth hideous. Divine advents are merciful judgments because they offer redemption. The Dayspring from on high gives light to men in the shadow of death and guides into the path of peace.

The Bible insists that God visits men to wake them

to become His partners in His purpose for their day in History. That is the teaching of the entire New Testament.

To be sure there are some things which God does not ask men to share with Him. We sinners are not invited to climb the judgment-seat and pronounce verdicts on brother men. It is not for us to mete out retribution to nations or individuals. Vengeance "belongs" to God: vindictive men unfit themselves to become peacemakers.

But this does not absolve a man or a people from taking part in God's merciful justice. We are "to loose the bands of wickedness, to undo the heavy burdens, to let the oppressed go free, and to break every yoke." Evil in a moral universe brings on its own retribution, but in history the retribution seldom arrives without conscientious and courageous human instruments. Shakespeare's Macbeth declares:

"We still have judgment here; that we but teach Bloody instructions, which being taught, return To plague the inventor: this even-handed justice Commends the ingredients of our poison'd chalice To our own lips."

But he portrays the son of the murdered king, the outraged nobility and the oppressed people of Scotland rising to execute justice in freeing the land from bloody tyranny.

No sane Christian can foresee the establishment of a righteous, orderly and peaceful fellowship of nations without a breaking of the clutch of oppressors.

And God's advent in another Christmas season has turned our scrutiny inward to search our own consciences. Most of us are persuaded that there cannot be a commonwealth of free peoples without the limitation of national sovereignty. With American tenacity of independence, are we ready to make this offering for peace? We are taxing ourselves enormously for defense: have we the resolve to continue such outlay for the repair of ruined economies, and for the setting up and holding up of the machinery for stable government to secure liberty? We must

face the long and difficult struggle essential to procure even the beginnings of supernational political institutions in the post-war day. We cannot prepare for this too soon or too thoroughly. There is a titanic spiritual task to get ourselves and our fellow-citizens ready for the thinking and the counselling with other peoples, for the huge and continuing sacrifice, which this, the richest, least damaged, most cosmopolitan and most powerful of contemporary nations, must

make for a just peace.

In the black night of this present time Christmas has been to us the festival of a burning and a shining Light. No Christian can have kept this anniversary of God's incarnation in Jesus with an easy conscience. "Now is the judgment of this world," we know that we are among the guilty. Well for us that He comes a Saviour with forgiveness for the penitent. And no Christian can have kept the festival without seeing more plainly evils that men of goodwill inspired by God should do away. Now must the prince of this world be cast out. And the festival should surely have brought again the light of hope:-a hope for our country that it may be an Immanuel's land, "a repairer of the breach, a restorer of paths to dwell in": and a hope for the Christian Church, that the desperate plight of mankind may serve to unite her forces in witness and work, and send all her members to draw more humbly and confidently on the exhaustless resources of our ever-arriving and all-sufficient God.

We are at War

Two important lessons stand forth as one surveys the catastrophic events which have plunged our reluctant nation into the world conflict.

The first is the unpalatable truth that our past unwillingness to face facts will now exact a terrific toll as we gird ourselves for a grim, and probably, long struggle. The swift and furious blow, which brought us into the conflict, found us unprepared, both technically and spiritually, though we ought to have anticipated it. It was the culmination toward which all developments of the past years had been pointing. All through the dreary months of controversy and argument, of division and debate we displayed a well-nigh incredible blindness to the obvious. Certainly since Dunquerque, and probably since the attack upon Poland, and possibly since the milestones of Prague and Munich, the real question has been not whether the United States would become involved but when the American people could bring themselves to face the inexorable logic of our tragic contemporary history.

Even the manner of the initial blow, the surprise attack without warning, should not have surprised us, in view of the fact that it has become a stereotyped method of Fascist strategy. There was novelty in the skill of execution but not in the manner of attack. The rage which has inflamed some of our people is partly the rage of wounded pride, that we should have been struck so sharp a blow and suffered so severe a loss. In part it expresses an unconscious sense of humiliation for our failure to heed the warnings of history during the past five years.

The nation has responded with almost unanimous assent to the President's radio address of December 9th. Yet that address presented no new facts and elaborated no new truths, which we had not known six months or even sixteen months earlier, except of course the one fact which brought the general facts and the general truths home to us. History had overtaken us while we were still debating whether or not we should assume the obligations toward which history pointed. In these latter months the Administration has been charged with deviousness and subterfuge and the charges were not wholly without foundation. We are now confronted with the disagreeable discovery that the refusal of great numbers to face reality, rather than the desire of leaders to deceive the public, was the cause of whatever deviousness there may have been in our public policy.

There can be no justice in the world if we resent only the injustice which is done us, however human it may be to feel our own hurt more keenly than that done to others. Yet the events of the distant past present the same unheeded lessons as those of the immediate past. Had the world united in a firm "Thou shalt not" when Japan seized Manchuria, the long sequence of aggression might never have begun. Had this nation sustained the President's quarantine proposal when Japan invaded China, China might long since have been delivered from the invader and we would now be free to meet the more potent enemy in Europe and Africa without distraction. In all likelihood the planes which wrought such havoc at Pearl Harbor were built of American iron, and fueled by American, British and Dutch oil, sold to Japan while she was perfecting her brilliantly conceived attack.

cl

fo

yo

ro

fo

is

th

ju

an

ins

sel

on

lav

jus

his

eve

mie for

mil

In the face of immediate perils and responsibilities, which will tax every resource of body, mind and soul, there is little profit in retrospective "might-havebeens," save as they guard us against future follies. Past mistakes and the bitter reverses of the present hour teach the same lesson: There is no escape from moral responsibility, and no evasion of our duty toward our neighbors in the community of nations. We are not the only nation which has had to learn that lesson. We are only the last to learn it.

But there is also a more heartening lesson in the

events of these tragic days. That lesson is that fright-fulness does meet its nemesis. The invincible resolution of the British people, the now established unity of all the free peoples of the earth, and the unbroken spirit of subjugated nations, now writhing in impotence but waiting for the day when they can participate in their emancipation, all these factors in the world situation spell the ultimate doom of tyranny. To them we may now add the unity and resolution of our own nation, forged by history rather than by oratory or propaganda. Japan's aggression upon Hawaii has not only brought us into the conflict which has the overthrow of tyranny as its immediate purpose; it has also assured our participation in the peace and, we hope, our continuing loyalty

S

d

0

IS

1-

18

er

 $^{\mathrm{id}}$

m

of

ts

rot ch

s-

laole

ce

ve

ess

ent

an

nan

ast

the

rm

the

un.

ine

ght

and

my

ke-

earl

by

hile

ack.

ies,

oul,

ave-

lies.

sent

rom

to-

We

that

the

Y. 879. to a community of free nations, faced with years of strife and decades of striving toward the goal of an ordered and just world.

It remains for us in the Christian church so to proclaim and to mediate the mercy of God that we may help our nation to live through this ordeal with fortitude and, above all, with freedom from hatred and bitterness. We can hardly do better than make the words of our greatest American our watchword:

"With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right; let us strive to finish the work we are in . . . to all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

The Vicious Circle

DR. MAUDE A. ROYDEN

DURING the last war, a friend said to me "God isn't interested in justice, He is only interested in love."

It gave me a shock; but it gradually dawned on me that if I had ever taken our Lord's teachings about justice seriously (I do not say literally but seriously) it would not have been shocking to me but a mere commonplace.

In the Sermon on the Mount this is made quite clear. Jesus said: "Ye have heard that it has been said, An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth: But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." This is not simply a condemnation of a barbarous standard of ethics. It is a call to go forward from a good standard to an ideal one. ("Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect.") A barbarous ethical standard allowed those who held it to demand vengeance for an injury. If a man was injured, he might kill his enemy and his enemy's wife or wives and children and cattle -even perhaps wipe out his whole tribe. There are instances of such atrocities in the Old Testament itself, which even appear to have divine sanction, but on the whole the children of Israel recognized a higher law. Men must not ask for vengeance but only for justice. "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth."

Because they had reached this level Jesus called his people to go forward. They must learn not to ask even for justice. They must not hate even their enemies but love them. They must not ask even an eye for an eye but actually do good to their persecutors.

The Sermon on the Mount is one of the most familiar passages in the whole Bible to Christian ears.

In many churches it is read aloud very frequently. Its very familiarity has dulled our ears. It does not strike us that our Lord here disinterests himself in justice—which we feel it actually a duty to demand—and insists only on love.

Like all Christ's commands, this one is realistic for in fact it is not possible to be just in the sense that is generally attached to the word. It is not merely human wickedness that makes us unjust; it is that justice, as human beings conceive it, is impossible. Consider the case of many of the suffering nations in the present war-Poland for example. It is (or was) notorious that Poland was a very uneasy neighbor of all countries bordering on it, from the end of the last war to the beginning of this. But why? Because Poland had been maltreated beyond any other country in Europe. Having been partitioned herself -more than once-it seemed to her just that she should entrench herself against her enemies even at the cost of partitioning others. Why not? Had not she been partitioned?

Now Poland is once more torn to bits. When she is again in a position to demand, what will she not demand—in the name of justice?

And indeed, how is it possible, with the greatest possible wish to be just, to draw a just line marking the frontiers of any countries that are not islands? No line that can ever be drawn between such countries will leave all the nationals of one on one side and all the nationals of the other on the other side. The thing is ridiculous. And so there will always be minorities and they can truly say that the frontier which shuts them out from their own country is unjust.

Another outstanding example of the unreality of

human justice presents itself in the claim to possess colonies. It is admitted by many that one of the greater injustices of the Treaty of Versailles was the seizure by Great Britain and France of German colonies in Africa. How shall this injustice be put right? By giving them back! Many liberals and pacifists have made this surprising proposal, and some go even further, proposing to extend the principle of giving "Lebensraum" to the empire-less nations which came too late for the share-out of the world. This, they urge, is mere justice, especially in the case of the German colonies.

But what justice does this offer to the human beings whom it is thus proposed to hand over, as their share, to other human beings? Could anything seem more grotesque to them than this act of restoration? Great Britain, it is argued, took German East Africa: let her now restore it and justice will be satisfied. By no means, say the inhabitants of that country. And are they not also right?

Dr. Harold Moodie, Founder and President of the League of Colored Peoples, whose headquarters is in London, has been and still is a keen critic of British imperialism. He has had much occasion for criticism and no one will suggest that he admires us too much. Yet he protested with vigor against the idea that the colonies we took from Germany should have been "given back" to them. We had no right to take them but neither have we any right to give them. They belong to the people who inhabit them and these people should be allowed to decide for themselves.*

"The people who inhabit them": here is another snag. An American woman once described to me a pow-wow with an Indian chief at which she was privileged to be present. The question was of a reservation and of the lines to be drawn about it. Suddenly the old Indian lost his temper. He rose to his feet and with fiery arrogance denounced the pale-faces who came to bargain with him thus. What were they doing after all? They were asking him to consent to the partitioning of a country which belonged to him and to his people! They argued about lines and frontiers here and there, when all of it—all—was theirs who had lived in it from the time immemorial. My American friend said she hung her head with shame as the old man's furious eloquence flowed over it.

But was this all? The Red Indian had indeed possessed the land. What had he made of it? Nothing—or so little that in an extra hard winter he and his people starved and many died. Would it have been "just" to reserve for Indians the vast territory, abounding in natural wealth, which is now the United

States of America? Is there no justice in the cry "the tools" (and the earth) "to him that can use them"? Must millions crowd themselves into the old exploited lands of Europe while a few hundreds of thousands hunted and fished a continent?

Certainly the motives and the methods of the conqueror of North and South America alike are often to be condemned, as are those of all conquerors everywhere. This does not, however, touch the fundamental question—what is justice?

Since all this is obvious, why do we continually talk of enforcing justice between nations? Because the instinct of retaliation is very strong and we must dress it up in some reputable disguise. There are two sets of people in the world: one reacts to pain with the determination that others shall suffer because they have suffered; the other with the determination that, knowing what it is to suffer, they will by no means make others do so, but rather will do all in their power to make such suffering impossible. These are the saviors of the world, for these break the vicious circle that we call "justice." In old times, tribes or communities used to execute justice on one another. In consequence, feuds once begun were endless. They were carried on from generation to generation until everyone had forgotten the nature of the original injury. It was not necessary to remember it for each act of "justice" of itself set in motion the next. If one were to ask who first began the fatal series, it would be necessary to go back to Cain. Yet still, above all in international questions, people cry like children in a nursery, "he began it!"

People today are trying to prove that Germany began all the troubles of Europe of over a century. Looking carefully at her evil deeds, we feel that justice demands her punishment. Human justice does, no doubt. But we are also in fault. We trod her down in 1919. Now she wants to tread us down. Is that, she says, not justice?

of

fa

th

tal

in

ze

an

the

wa

als

wh

me

pre

der

lea

tion

con

tha

ize

ing

a n

But there is no end to this. For if Germany were to win the war and trample on her conquerors, should not we in the name of justice plan unceasingly for the hour when we should get our own back?

Even the pre-Christian world dimly saw the tragic fallacy of this justice. Helen of Troy betrayed her husband and fled. He pursued her to execute justice on the seducer, who must be punished though a nation fall. To accomplish this, a king sacrificed his child. His wife took her vengeance on him by committing adultery and then murdering him. His son, bound by the most sacred ties of filial piety, must avenge the murderer of his father—who is his mother! Here the madness of human justice appears. For though it was Orestes' duty to execute his father's murderer, he must now himself expiate the horrible crime of matricide. He goes mad, pursued by Furies. What can make an end of this? Clearly

^{*}I once said to a man who had had great experience of colonial administration in Africa that I supposed it would be impossible to consult the natives of any given area as to their wishes in such a matter, as they could not have knowledge or judgment enough to decide. He was highly amused and said: "We could find out very well if we wanted to but we don't want to. Why should we?"

forgiveness and forgiveness only. The most innocent victim of all, the daughter sacrificed by her father that justice may be done on the seducer of Helen is found to have been rescued at the last moment and, though she too sets in motion once more the machinery of "justice," she finds that her brother must be her victim and forgives. The vicious circle is broken.

It is a Christian thought in pagan dress—someone has lost interest in justice and thought only of love. And here at last the long and ghastly sequence of

tragedies ends.

y .,

S

e

S

r

r. y il

al h [f

it 11,

ce

e-

IS-

es,

er

Is

re

 $_{\rm lld}$

gic

ier

IS-

ı a

his

m-

on,

ust

his

ars.

fa-

the

ued

arly

If, when the time for peace-making comes, and before, those who call themselves Christians were preoccupied with love and could transcend the old and
senseless clamour for justice, they would be asking
themselves only one thing—what is best for each nation and what is best for all. This would be hard
enough to decide for who is wise enough to judge?
But it has two advantages at least: there is a "best"
for nations and for the world, but there is no "justice." We are therefore pursuing an end that exists
though we shall not perfectly reach it, instead of one

that perpetually eludes us because it does not exist. And secondly, the pursuit unites instead of dividing us. Since there is no real justice such as we clamour for, every nation will be convinced that what is dealt out to it is unjust; and every nation will be right. What seems to us to be justice will seem to the other side no more than revenge or, as in the case of Colonial possessions, a caricature of justice achieved by the cheap method of giving away what does not belong to the giver.

It is for us to consider these matters very gravely for already rash promises are being made and still more are being asked for—and always in the name of justice. If we pursue this hopeless quest we shall make another mess of the post-war world. Justice will again be confused with vengeance for justice is impossible. The idealist Christ who forbade Christians to concern themselves with it, and instead to love their enemies, proves once more to be the realist. Only forgiveness can break the tragic circle of human shame inflicted and endured. Only the best for all can mean the best for each.

Presidents Have Been Hated Before

WILLIAM W. SWEET

It is a great pity, especially in such times as this, that Mr. Average Citizen has so little knowledge and understanding of American history. Ignorance of the past is one of the reasons, at least, why we as a people keep on repeating the same mistakes that our fathers and grandfathers have made. If, for instance, there had been a full understanding of what had taken place in the United States during and following the Civil War, and if the average American citizen could have drawn the lessons that are there for any intelligent person to learn, the tragic mistakes of the nineteen-twenties might have been avoided.

During the Civil War as during the Great World War the President of the United States assumed the war-time powers granted in the Constitution. He also was compelled to exercise frequently powers which were not specifically constitutional, in order to meet new requirements and for which there were no precedents. This necessary expansion of the presidential powers in times of national danger and crisis leaves Congress a much more limited sphere of action than it has in normal times. In fact, under such conditions Congress of necessity becomes little more than a rubber stamp whose principal work is to legalize the necessary acts of the President. An interesting illustration as to how President Lincoln met many a new situation is shown by his action in appointing

chaplains for hospital service at the opening of the Civil War. There were laws providing for regimental chaplains but none for hospital service. The President had no legal right to appoint such officials, and yet he proceeded to do so, stating, that he would ask Congress at its next session to make his act legal. This was accordingly done and a real and universally recognized need was thus met.

Of all war administrations Mr. Lincoln's interfered most with individual rights and personal liberties. The suspension, early in the war, of the writ of habeas corpus led to many civilian arrests by military authorities throughout the North, and the military prisons were filled with civilians, many of whom were never tried, and never were told why they were seized. In fact Abraham Lincoln was much more of a military dictator than any of our presidents. Naturally the exercise of such powers led to bitter denunciation on the part of many people, especially the Peace Democrats, both in and out of Congress. Many of the opposition newspapers continually denounced these acts as unconstitutional and made bitter personal attacks upon the President. As the party of opposition grew in numbers and virulence there developed along with it an under-current of bitter personal hatred of the President that festered and spread as the war continued. Following the war, in the case Ex Parte Milligan, the Supreme Court decided that military tribunals were illegal except where war made the operation of the civil courts impossible. The arrests during the war had been made on the part of the Federal government however, on the belief that they were in accord with the war powers of the President as laid down in the Constitution.

Generally President Lincoln's party stood by him until toward the end of the war when the whole matter of the peace came up for consideration. Thus as in the World War it was the peace which brought discord and dissension and finally disaster. When it was learned by such vindictive radicals as Senator Benjamin F. Wade of Ohio and Representatives George W. Julian of Indiana and Thaddeus Stevens of Pennsylvania that the President was advocating generous and mild treatment of the Southern states, their fury knew no bounds. Many Senate and House members now began to nurse a sullen distrust of the President. Senator Wilson of Massachusetts, later to become Vice-president of the United States, sought to discredit the whole conduct of the war and other haters and belittlers became increasingly vocal. Julian of Indiana even hinted on the floor of the House that impeachment proceedings against President Lincoln might be inaugurated. In the midst of this rising tide of mistrust and personal hatred Abraham Lincoln was assassinated. It is doubtful even if Lincoln had lived whether he would have been able to stem the tide of hatred and bring about the just peace for the South which he planned. He died with the noble words of the second inaugural upon his lips:

With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; ... to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace, among ourselves, and with all nations.

With his passing there began an orgy of vindictiveness carried through by a coterie of President-haters which nullified everything for which Abraham Lincoln had stood.

With bungling, tactless Andrew Johnson in the presidential office there was no chance for a just and honorable peace for which the martyred President had so devoutly prayed. Johnson's blundering course only added fuel to the flame. It is true after a few weeks of bluster at the beginning of his administration Johnson tried to put Lincoln's plan of reconstruction into operation, but it was to be of no avail. When Congress convened in December, 1865, with Benjamin F. Wade, one of the principal president haters as pro tempore president of the Senate, and the even more bitter and able Thaddeus Stevens in

control of the House, all that Lincoln and Johnson had done in the interest of justness and brotherly kindness was swept away and the disgraceful period of military and carpet-bag rule of the South was ushered in.

It ought to be instructive to the clergy of our day to note the part played by the Northern preachers in this whole affair. When in May, 1868, President Andrew Johnson's impeachment trial was in progress in the Hall of Congress in Washington the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church was in session in the city of Chicago. On May 13th and again on May 14th resolutions were introduced in the Conference bearing upon the impeachment trial. A set of resolutions was finally adopted by a unanimous vote to devote an hour of prayer to beseech the mercy of God upon the nation, and "save the Senators from error" so that they might all be led to vote for the conviction of the President of the United States. So sure was the Washington correspondent of the Congregational Advance that President Johnson would be impeached and removed from office that he devoted his column in the issue of May 14, 1868 to speculation as to the personnel of Ben Wade's Cabinet, who as President pro tem of the Senate was scheduled to succeed Johnson in the presidential office. These are simply examples of the attitude of many of the Northern evangelical clergy on this issue. But that was not the first time nor the last that preachers have lined up on the wrong side.

eı

th

pi

pi

na

it

it

ar

th

tic

its

sp

of it:

the

sib

of

wi

do

lab

Such was the pattern furnished by the Civil War and Reconstruction period which has been followed line for line in every similar crisis since. What happened after the World War we call "disillusionment." Which means simply that America went back on its ideals. How soon we began to sneer and laugh sarcastically at those phrases, many of them coined by President Wilson which expressed for the American people their idealism of the war years. We were fighting a "war to end war"; to "make the world safe for Democracy"; and for the "self determination of peoples." All of them were glorious ideals; they are as glorious today as they were then. What influences were responsible for the change which came almost over night? Why did the American people turn away from an absorbing interest in helping to make a better world to an almost absolute self-interest? In 1918 we were convinced that we had a great world duty to perform; in 1920 we proclaimed in the election of Warren G. Harding that "this is not our world." This mood was well illustrated by a cartoon which appeared during the presidential campaign of 1920. It pictured General Pershing mounted on a great white elephant riding rapidly away from the tomb of Lafayette and calling back over his shoulder, "Lafayette, we've quit." And that is just what we had done -we had quit. But why did we quit? To a large degree it was because of the insidious work of another group of president haters. Others had taken the place of Wade and Butler, of Julian and Stevens but they were of the same stripe.

n

t

S

al

S

e

A

ne

a-

te

 $^{\mathrm{ed}}$

nt

nat

58

's

as

f-

of

nis

ist

ar

ed

p-

t."

its arby

an ere afe

of

are

ces

ost

vay

et-

918

uty

of

ld."

nich

)20.

reat

of

fay-

one

de-

It was good politics in those days to denounce the idealism of the war years, and a good share of the responsibility for wrecking the plans for an adequate world organization, that would have gone a long way toward making the world safe for democracy, must be laid at the door of the petty politicians who swarmed like a pest of locusts across the land in the nineteen-twenties. For many, the chief motive was no higher than to drive out the party in power and to gain the offices and the emoluments for themselves. Thus was ushered in the disgraceful and greedy twenties. At the bottom of it all was a little group of President-haters, many of them mean and small men, but, as in the eighteen-sixties, they, although a minority, were able to keep the United States from taking her place in a needy world.

In the midst of the storm and fury of the controversy that swept the land in 1919 and 1920 over the question of the ratification of the Treaty and our entrance into the League of Nations, President Woodrow Wilson suffered a stroke of paralysis (September 26, 1919). How much secret exultation that occasioned can only be surmised. I heard one preacher state from his pulpit that he considered it a providential happening. But few men were as aboveboard as old Ben Wade who on hearing of the assassination of President Lincoln expressed his belief that it was for the best interests of the country. And so it was again as after the Civil War, we won a war and lost the peace.

When the Great War ended the leadership of the world was thrust upon the United States. We were the only first class power that had not been impoverished by the war. We had shown ourselves a generous and warm-hearted people in feeding the hungry in the impoverished and vanquished nations. Naturally they looked to us to help them rebuild their political as well as their economic structures. But the dark tragedy of it all was that we turned our backs upon them. We failed them and the world. What share in that disgraceful outcome must be placed to the discredit of the little group of selfish men, whose mainspring of action was their hatred of Woodrow Wilson we are willing to let the facts in the case determine.

And now what shall we say of the present crisis? Are we doomed to repeat the tragic mistakes that were committed after the Civil War and again after the World War? Must we continue to permit such mean and low motives as personal venom to dictate the policy of our great nation? The same type of opposition that developed during the Civil War and again during the World War is becoming increasingly apparent. We of today have our Wades, our Julians, our Ben Butlers and our Thad Stevens. Their vindictiveness and bitterness is even more exaggerated, if that were possible, than was that of the former President haters. Many of them are small, mean men more anxious to further their own political ends than to serve their nation and the world.

"... ye can discern the face of the sky and the earth; but how is it that ye do not discern this time."

The World Church: News and Notes

Plans for a New Social Order

Under the chairmanship of the Archbishop of York, the Commission of the Churches of Britain for International Friendship and Social Responsibility has published its first statement on "Social Justice and Economic Responsibility." The statement is probably more important than the now famous Malvern Report. It is the statement of an official commission, which Malvern was not, and it represents the authority of the free churches as well as the Church of England.

The document declares that a "good omen" of the possibility of social reconstruction lies "throughout all classes of the community that very big social changes are inevitable and rightly due." It asserts that "it is now widely recognized that the free play of economic forces does not secure a wise distribution of either capital or labor," but rather produces "poverty in the midst of

plenty and rivalry to the verge of war." It calls upon the Church to "refer men to the standard of society inherent in man's creation in the image of God and call upon men to repent for their forgetfulness or defiance of that standard." It declares that "man is made by God for responsible cooperation with his fellowmen in pursuit of ends which he knows to be inherently right and he is affronted and demoralized when he is required to live in a society which does not recognize those ends."

It derives the necessity of social systems and structure from the fact that man "is prone to be over assertive of his own rights and negligent and evasive in regard to his duties." It declares that the "demand for a living wage" cannot be ruled out of court by the assertion that "it is more than industry can bear."

The plans for a "New Britain" call for more universal educational facilities, for "full provision of family needs," for "a national policy designed to promote rural repopulation," for a post-war re-employment policy which will

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, Chairman

JOHN C. BENNETT
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM
F. ERNEST JOHNSON
HENRY SMITH LEIPER
JOHN A. MACKAY

RHODA E. McCulloch
FRANCIS P. MILLER
EDWARD L. PARSONS
HOWARD C. ROBBINS
HENRY P. VAN DUSEN

HELEN LANE ROBERTS, Editorial Assistant

prevent anyone "now in the country's service" from being "allowed to pass into the ranks of the unemployed."

It calls for international arrangements which will "regularize the distribution of raw materials of the world and the allocation of the world's markets."

It declares that its principles are framed according to the Christian faith and its conception of God and man and "not according to the tenets of any political party."

Church and State in Switzerland

At the Zurich Church Synod on October 29, 1941, the President, Judge Max Wolff, delivered the opening address on the relations of Church and State. Among other things he said:

"The State too, in all the extent and all the dreadfulness of its power, comes within the area of Christ's power. . . . We Reformed Churchmen have a word to say to the State. The Reformed Church must cling with all its determination to this position, if it is not to be untrue to its confession of faith; it cannot therefore allow political authorities to limit in an arbitrary way its sphere of action. . . . For our Reformed Church, service of the truth means the same thing as service of its Lord. To be silent about the truth means for a Reformed Christian to deny Jesus Christ. Zwingli has said this clearly enough: 'We must prefer death to concealment of the truth.' Only obedience to God's Word has a promise attached to it. If the attempt is made to say anything different to our nation, then its soul is harmed. . . . There is a great danger connected with the neutral attitude of mind which our nation is supposed to adopt. . The Church would be unfaithful to its mission if it silently accepted measures which arbitrarily restrict the statement of the truth, for it knows that justice has its origin in God and that God is denied when justice and injustice are no longer allowed to be called by their proper names." I. C. P. I. S., Geneva.

Public Library Woodward & Kirby Aves. Detroit, Mich.

650 1-43

Catholic Attitude in Ireland

The Dublin government has sent a communication to the American Catholic weekly, *The Commonweal*, protesting against an article in this journal by Michael Williams in which Ireland is accused of favoring German propaganda. The Government insists that the Irish censorship rules seek to preserve absolute impartiality between the two sides and that if a broadcast of the English Cardinal Hinsley is suppressed, it must be remembered that statements of continental and Italian Bishops have also been suppressed.

Deputy Williams Cosgrave recently voiced the Irish conception of neutrality as follows: "We are not bound to take sides in a conflict of this kind. . . . It is a fact that a very great number of Christians are on both sides and a very great number of Catholics also. It is no part of the Catholic teaching or the Catholic religion that majorities decide whether things are right or wrong in time of war."

Anti-Semitism is Treason against God

In a sermon preached at the First Presbyterian Church in Englewood, New Jersey, Dr. Henry Smith Leiper of the World Council of Churches, declared that "anti-Semitism is treason against God." In this sermon which has been given wide publicity and has been received with great approval, Dr. Leiper declared, "you cannot make your opposition to anti-Semitism effective simply by abstaining from unjust and unfair prejudices and discriminations. . . . You can take a positive Christian and American stand in defense of justice and equal treatment. . . . You can show your sympathy and friendliness to individual Jews who sorely need comfort and reassurance in days like these. . . . We must all remind ourselves that anti-Semitism in any form is treason to our democratic heritage and to the Kingdom of God whose word tells us plainly 'If a man say I love God and hateth his brother, he is a liar and the truth is not in him."

Authors in This Issue

Dr. Maude Royden has been well known internationally for many years. She began her ministry at the City Temple in London. For many years she was the leader of a religious group which met at the Guild Hall in London. She is lecturing and preaching in America at present under the auspices of the Federal Council of Churches.

Dr. William Sweet is professor of Church History at the Divinity School of Chicago University. He is a specialist in American Church History.

Editorial Announcements

We are happy to announce that Dr. Howard Chandler Robbins, chairman of our board of sponsors, Dr. Henry Smith Leiper and Dr. F. Ernest Johnson have joined the editorial board and will henceforth contribute regularly to our journal.

With this issue *Christianity and Crisis* appears in a new garb, which, we hope, will appeal to our readers. In our next issue, the first of the new year, we shall outline our program for the coming year.

H

ve

ci

hi

fu

m

ha

of

int

co

go

du

ma

to

thr

Th

stre

rec

mu